

CHAPTER ELEVEN*

ART, BEAUTY, AND THE BUSINESS OF RUNNING A BUDDHIST MONASTERY IN EARLY NORTHWEST INDIA

Gregory Schopen

It is very difficult still to get an overview of Early North India—dates, dynasties, denominations and deities there are still the subjects of sometimes unedifying debate. We work, of course, with what we have, and what we have are broken walls and tangled trenches, stray inscriptions and reused pots, coins, images out of context, and conclusions hanging by a thread. So much energy and erudition goes into sorting all these things out that important questions go unasked. We are usually so preoccupied with what is there that we often do not ask—do not even wonder—why it is. When, for example, so much of the raw data for North Indian numismatics comes from Buddhist monastic sites and ritual deposits are we not obliged to ask why this is so? How is it that groups of ascetic, celibate men who were supposed to have renounced all wealth and social ties, left such largess in the archeological record, how is it that they, and sometimes they alone, lived in North India in permanent, architecturally sophisticated quarters, that they, and they alone, lived in intimate association with what we call art? Something is clearly wrong with this picture and there is a very good chance that we have not yet understood the people in North India who handled the coins we study or the pots we classify. As an example—and it is only that—of an important group of such people, it is perhaps worthwhile to try again to understand what exactly a Buddhist monk was in Early North India. We can do this now a little better because we now know a little better an important Buddhist monastic code that appears to have been redacted there. That the Buddhist monk in Early North India, and in this monastic code, did not look like the caricature found in modern scholarly sources will come as no surprise to those

who know well what he left behind in his living quarters. The monk that we will see in this code is a construction-foreman, an art promoter, a banker, an entrepreneur, sometimes a shyster, and sometimes a saint—he should at least prove to be of some interest.

The monastic code in question, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, has been known in one form or another for a long time now,¹ and although it was very early on recognized that this code was compiled or redacted in Northwest India, the discussion of its date has been badly misdirected by a very red herring and the inattention of those who were supposed to be following the trail. In 1958 the great Belgian scholar Étienne Lamotte declared that this *Vinaya* or Code was late, that “... one cannot attribute to this work a date earlier than the 4th–5th Centuries of the Christian Era.”² This pronouncement—even at its inception based on very shaky grounds—still proved almost fatal since Lamotte himself was forced by his own further work to change his position—and he did so several times—but very few scholars seem to have noticed. By 1966 Lamotte was in fact referring to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as a source of information for the 1st or 2nd Century of our era.³

¹ Examples of early work published on this *Vinaya* are first of all Alexander Csoma de Körös, “Analysis of the Dulva. A Portion of the Tibetan Work Entitled the Kahgyur,” *Asiatik Researches* 20 (1836): 41–93 (later translated into French in Léon Feer, *Analyse du kandjour. Recueil des livres sacrés au tibet*. Annales du Musée Guimet II (Paris, 1881), 146–198). In the 1870s Anton von Schieferer published a long series of papers under the title “Indische Erzählungen” in *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg* (listed in detail in Jampa Losang Panglung, *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya. Analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung* (Tokyo, 1981), 254–255), which were in turn translated into English in W.R.S. Ralston, *Tibetan Tales derived from Indian Sources* (London, 1882), and made available a significant sampling of the narrative literature found in this *Vinaya*—indeed the work might have been more accurately entitled “Tales or Stories from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,” though a very few of the ‘tales’ came from elsewhere. W. Woodville Rockhill also did early important work on this *Vinaya* (“Le traité d’émancipation ou Pratimoksa Sutra,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 9 (1884): 3–26; 167–201; “Tibetan Buddhist Birth-Stories: Extracts and Translations from the Kandjur,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 18 (1897): 1–14; *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkah-Hgyur and Bstan-Hgyur* (London, 1907).

² Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien. Des origines à l’ère śāka* (Louvain, 1958), 727.

³ For references and further, sometimes overlapping discussion, see Gregory Schopen, “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an Early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27 (1999): 292–293; and Gregory Schopen, *Daijō bukkyō kōki jidai Indo no sōin seikatsu*, translated by Odani Nobuchiyo (Tokyo, 2000), 39ff.

Ironically other scholars then, and for a long time after, continued to quote only the Lamotte of 1958.⁴ The changes in Lamotte's views, which he never explicitly acknowledged, brought them eventually into conformity with the views of others who had specifically addressed the issue and been ignored. Today, it seems, the views of the Italian Raniero Gnoli hold the field. He said in 1977: "However, one point seems certain to me: the date of the compilation of the *Vinaya* of the *MSV* is to be taken back to the times of Kaniṣka."⁵ And, but for a few quibbles, this would seem fine. Gnoli, as others before him, relies in part for his dating on the fact that one section of this Code—in a passage preserved in the Sanskrit manuscript from Gilgit—refers both to Kaniṣka by name and to the *stūpa* of Kaniṣka at a place it calls Kharjūrikā.⁶ This passage in turn forms a part of what Sylvain Lévi long ago called "un véritable *māhātmya* du Nord-Ouest de l'Inde."⁷ Both the presence of Kaniṣka's name, and the *māhātmya* as a whole, have been taken as interpolations "which tend to show that the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins had undergone a rehandling around the beginning of the Christian Era."⁸ But if the *māhātmya* containing the reference to Kaniṣka is an interpolation made at somewhere near his time, or if this *Vinaya* underwent a rehandling or redaction—"un remaniement"—around the beginning of the Christian era, it seems fairly obvious that it must have existed in some form or in some part even before that time. And there are other indications of this as well.

It is of course neither possible nor desirable to enter here into all the specifics. It must suffice to simply note that the more we learn

⁴ For but one prominent example see J.W. de Jong's review of H. Falk, *Schrift im alten Indien*, in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 39 (1996): 69.

⁵ *Sanighabhedavastu* (Gnoli) i, "General Introduction," xix.

⁶ *Bhaisajyavastu*, *GMs* iii 1, 1.20–2.5—for the reading of this passage in the Gilgit manuscript itself and some discussion see Schopen 2000, 42–45.

⁷ Cited from the short "Introduction" S. Lévi wrote to Jean Przyluski, "Le nord-ouest de l'inde dans le vinaya des mūlasarvāstivādin et les textes apparentés," *Journal asiatique* (1914): 493–568. Przyluski translates here the Chinese translation of this "māhātmya" done by I-ching.

⁸ Edouard Huber, "Études bouddhiques. III—Le roi kaniṣka dans le vinaya des mūlasarvāstivādins," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 14 (1914): 19: "qui tendent à montrer que le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādins a subi un remaniement aux environs de l'ère chrétienne." This paper of Huber's, moreover, was also translated into English very shortly after its original publication in G.K. Nariman, *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism* (Bombay, 1919), 274–275.

about the contents of this Code, the clearer it becomes that it explicitly deals, often in great detail, with specific religious and monastic practices, ideas, and motives that we know from epigraphical and archeological sources were also current in North India both before and after the rise of the Kuṣāṇas, that it uses the same titles for learned monks and certain kinds of laymen, and describes—often again in great detail—some of the same elements of material culture that we find in that region. A Kharoṣṭhī inscription from Bahāwalpur and dated in the early years of Kaniṣka, for example, illustrates in a single instance several of these shared elements. It records that a monk named Nāgadatta, who is called a *dha[rma]kathi*, “a Narrator of the Dharma”—a title or office repeatedly referred to in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*⁹—“raised the staff” (*yathim aropayata*), i.e., inaugurated a *stūpa*, for “the Owner of the Monastery” (*vihārasvamī*) Balānandī. But not only is the title *Vihārasvāmin* repeatedly found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* where it designates the key lay figure in Mūlasarvāstivādin monasticism,¹⁰ this Code also contains an explicit reference—using virtually the same expression—to a monk’s obligation to be in attendance at “the raising of the staff” (*yastyāropana*).¹¹ There is, moreover, a whole series of Pre-Kuṣāṇa Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions—all securely dated to the very beginning of the Common Era—which record that individuals deposited relics at

⁹ See as a small sample: *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 3.19; *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 55.12; *Pravrajyavastu*, GMs iii 4, 56.12; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 247a.7; Ja 69a.2 = *Dīvyāvadāna* (Cowell & Neil) 493.15; etc.

¹⁰ See Gregory Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19.1 (1996): 81–126 [reprinted in *BMBM*, 219–259]; Schopen, “Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices,” in *Suryacandrīya. Essays in Honour of Akira Tuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. *Indica et Tibetica* 35, ed. Paul Harrison & Gregory Schopen (Swisttal-Odendorf, 1998), 158–179 [reprinted in *BMBM*, 260–284]. At this stage of our ignorance it appears that while the title *vihārasvāmin* might not be exclusive to Mūlasarvāstivādin sources it may well be predominantly a Mūlasarvāstivādin term. Th. Damsteegt, *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit* (Leiden, 1978), 165, says that the title “is apparently not found in Pāli,” and it certainly does not occur in the Pāli *Vinaya* even though the term *sassāmīka* occurs in conjunction with *vihāra* there (Pāli *Vinaya* iii 156). The lack of linkages between Pāli sources and the epigraphical and archeological records of the Northwest is in fact consistent, and points to the very limited utility of the former for understanding the latter.

¹¹ The passage in question, *Varṣāvastu*, GMs, iii 4, 139.11–17, has been discussed in some detail in Gregory Schopen, “The Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli *Vinaya*,” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 16 (1992): 87–107 [reprinted in Gregory Schopen, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks* (Honolulu, 1997), 72–85].

“a previously unestablished place” (*apratiṣṭhavita-prubami padhavi-pradeśāmi*), and in one case this action is specifically said to result in “the merit of Brahmā” (*brammapuñ[o] prasavati*).¹² This idea, the idea of establishing relics at previously “unconsecrated” places, an idea which appears to have motivated the actual behavior of a number of highly placed individuals in Pre-Kuṣāṇa North India, is again explicitly stated in our *Vinaya* in *exactly* the same language (*apratiṣṭhitapūrve pṛthivīpradeśe*), and explicitly stated there to result in “the merit of Brahmā” (*brāhmaṇa punyam prasavati*), raising the possibility at least that our *Vinaya* is in fact actually being quoted in this record.¹³ There are, as well, early Kuṣāṇa records that refer to learned monks as *trepidakas*, “those who know the Three Baskets,”¹⁴ and this title too repeatedly occurs in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.¹⁵ There is a series of records which record religious acts undertaken by monks and “co-residential pupils” (*sārdhanvihārin*) for the purpose of each other’s health (*arogadakshinae*),¹⁶ and this is a characteristically Mūlasarvāstivādin

¹² See for examples Richard Salomon, “The Bhagamoya Relic Bowl Inscription,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27 (1984): 108 (1.2); Gérard Fussman, “Nouvelles inscriptions śaka (II),” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 73 (1984): 33 (1.2); 35 (1.2); 39 (11.7–9); Fussman, “Nouvelles inscriptions śaka (III),” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 74 (1985): 37 (1.3); Fussman, “Documents épigraphiques kouchans (IV). Ajitasena, père de Senavarma,” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 75 (1986): 2 (1.5); Salomon, “The Reliquary Inscription of Utara: A New Source for the History of the Kings of Apraca,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31 (1988): 169. For the inscription which refers explicitly to “the merit of Brahmā” see Richard Salomon & Gregory Schopen, “The Indravarman (Avaca) Casket Inscription Reconsidered: Further Evidence for Canonical Passages in Buddhist Inscriptions,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 7.1 (1984): 108 (1.4).

¹³ The passage in question, *Saṅghabhedavastu* (Gnoli) ii 206.16, has been noticed in Salomon and Schopen 1984, 121–22, but the reservations expressed there in regard to whether or not the passage was original to this *Vinaya* need to be revisited and may well have been overstated. The same or a very similar passage also occurs in the *Ekottarāgama*, for example, but given the nature of this compilation the chances that it was the original source are certainly not better.

¹⁴ For convenience see the references in Gregory Schopen, “On Monks, Nuns, and ‘Vulgar’ Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism,” *Artibus Asiae* 49 (1988/89): 158–159 [Schopen 1997, 243].

¹⁵ See as a small sample: *Bhaisajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 55.12; *Pravrajyāvastu*, GMs iii 4, 56.12; *Pravrajyāvastu* (Eimer) ii 259.15; *Vibhangā*, Derge Ca 247a.7; Ja 64b.5 (= *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell & Neil) 488.3, though the Sanskrit has been abbreviated); Ja 80a.2 (= *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell & Neil) 505.2); Ja 227a.1; etc.

¹⁶ Sten Konow, *Kharoshthī Inscriptions with the Exception of those of Aśoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II.1 (Calcutta, 1929), LVIII (p. 124); LXXXVIII (p. 172); Heinrich Lüders, *Mathurā Inscriptions*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Dritte Folge, Nr. 47 (Göttingen, 1961), §§ 44, 46.

idea prominently enshrined, for example, in its ordination formulary where it is said that a newly ordained monk must be told: “You must, from this day forward and for as long as he lives, nurse your Preceptor. Your Preceptor too must attend to your illnesses until you are dead or cured.”¹⁷ In fact, the Preceptor/disciple relationship, for example, is defined almost exclusively in this Code in terms of mutual care giving.¹⁸ There are, finally, the Tōr Dherai inscribed pot fragments which refer not only to another *Vihārasvāmin* but to a *prapa*, a “hall for providing water” in a monastery,¹⁹ and our *Vinaya* again has *very* detailed rules governing both the construction and use of what appears to have been just such a “hall.”²⁰

Material of this sort—and as we will continue to see there is a very great deal of it in this enormous *Vinaya*—would appear to place this Code very much on the cusp of an era: many of the sorts of things it refers to are attested in the archeological and epigraphical records of North India both before the Kuṣāṇas and in the early Kuṣāṇa period itself. It seems in fact to span what may in any case be something of an artificial divide. But at least one more shared

¹⁷ *Pravrajāvastu* (Eimer) ii 163.12. For a Sanskrit text of the formulary see B. Jinananda, *Upasampadājñaptih* (Patna, 1961), esp. 26.3 for the passage cited. The *Upasampadājñaptih* appears to be an extract from the *Pravrajāvastu*, but its textual history is not actually known. For a translation of the entire formulary by Gregory Schopen see Donald S. Lopez, Jr., *Buddhist Scriptures* (London, 2004), 232–251.

¹⁸ For some texts illustrative of this very strong emphasis on the obligations of preceptors and pupils in regard to mutual care-giving, especially in times of illness, see *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 212b.3–213b.3; 213b.3–214a.7. On similar obligations, again in times of illness, of monks for other monks with whom they need not have a formally acknowledged relationship see *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 124.11–125.9; 128.1–131.15—(most of these are briefly discussed in G. Schopen, “The Good Monk and his Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of ‘The Mahāyāna Period,’ *Eastern Buddhist* ns 32.1 (2000): 95–96 [= Ch. I, *BMBM*]). *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 124.11ff contains a rule requiring monks to undertake acts of worship (*pūjā*) for the benefit of (*uddiṣyā*) a dying fellow-monk—a situation which might well lay behind several of our inscriptions—and is tentatively translated in Gregory Schopen, “Deaths, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code,” in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. D.S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton, 1995), 495–496 [= Ch. IV, *BMBM*].

¹⁹ Sten Konow, “Note on the Tōr-Dhērai Inscriptions,” in Aurel Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Waziristān and Northern Balūchistān. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India* 37 (Calcutta, 1929), 93–97; Konow 1929, XCII (pp. 173–77); cf. the series of pot inscriptions published and discussed in Richard Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra. The British Library Kharoṣṭī Fragments* (Seattle, 1999), 183–247.

²⁰ See *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 108a.6–110a.4; see also *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 50.18–51.9 on monastic wells and the monks’ obligation to distribute water there.

linkage between our monastic Code and the Northwest is worth citing because, if for no other reason, it concerns one of our most important sources of knowledge for Pre-Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇa North India.

Nobody really knows where the idea of using what we call “donative inscriptions” came from in South Asia, or why the Buddhists started to use them—and they were certainly the first to use them on any scale. But Émile Senart, one of the early and great masters of Indian epigraphy, recognized already a long time ago that at least one of their characteristic features originated in the Northwest. He said in 1890: “. . . it is in the Northwest that developed votive formulae first appear,”²¹ and little has appeared since that would affect this observation. Given that such developments occurred in the Northwest, and that the Northwest is so comparatively rich in early inscriptions, it is again probably not coincidental that our monastic Code has a good deal to say about what we would call inscriptions, and it is—to my knowledge—the only such Code that does.²²

Some of what our Code says about inscriptions is a little startling—even outrageous—and a glance at it will therefore serve the purpose of not only telling us something about monastic conceptions of inscriptions, but might also introduce the uninitiated to both the style, verve, and sometimes droll humor of this Code, and to the monastic world out of which it comes. The first text we might look at involves in fact putting restrictions on the monastic use of inscriptions, and tells the story of how the bowl of the famous monk Aniruddha ended up in a whorehouse. Aniruddha, according to the text,²³ had a young disciple who looked after his bowl. But since the young disciple washed both his own and Aniruddha’s bowl together they often got confused, so the disciple wrote on Aniruddha’s bowl:

²¹ É. Senart, “Notes d’épigraphie indienne,” *Journal asiatique* (1890): 122. There is now probably no need to pursue the question raised by Senart of foreign influence (“l’imitation des formules épigraphiques de l’Occident”) on the development of these formulae. They are far more explicable “par le jeu naturel des idées natives” than he could ever have seen, and a considerable amount of evidence for this is found, in fact, in our Code.

²² Obviously, much more needs to be known about all the *Vinayas* preserved now only in Chinese before such statements can have any dependable force. For the moment it can only be said that no such material has been noted so far in these *Vinayas*, and no material of this kind occurs in the canonical Pāli *Vinaya*.

²³ The text is found at *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 99a.7–100a.6.

“The bowl of the Preceptor Aniruddha” (. . . *des tshe dang ldan pa ma 'gags pa'i lhung bzed la slob dpon ma 'gags pa'i lhung bzed ces yi ge bris so*). Once, however, both went to a fine meal at the house of a layman. After the meal Aniruddha left but the disciple stayed behind to wash their bowls. While he was doing so the layman asked to borrow a bowl so he could send some of the fine food to his favorite prostitute and the disciple gave him Aniruddha’s bowl. The layman filled it with food and sent it to his favorite whore. When she poured out the food she saw the writing on the bottom of the bowl (*lhung bzed kyi zhabs la yi ge 'dug pa mthong nas*). When she read it—the text points out that for a woman she was clever—she thinks to herself. “It is not right for me to desecrate in this way the bowl of that Noble One who is worshipped by gods and men,” and she rubs it with perfume, fills it with sweet smelling flowers and places it on a painted stand (*khri'u tshon gyis bris pa*). It is, of course, bad enough that a famous monk’s bowl ends up in a private shrine in a whorehouse, but more is yet to come.

When another of her customers arrives “bringing five hundred *kārṣāpanas*, perfume and garlands” and wants to get right down to it, she puts him off. “Wait a minute—do worship to the bowl!” “Where did this bowl come from? Whose is it, anyhow?” he says. She tells him as much as she knows and he misunderstands even that, accusing her, in effect, of servicing renouncers (*pravrajita*). She, of course, denies what he implies, but the damage is done.

This little tale, written by a monk for other monks and bordering on burlesque, is used to justify the rule that “monks must not write what is not meant to be written!” (*de lta bas na dge slong dag mi bri ba ma bri shig*), which includes “what pertains to separate individuals” (*gang zag so so; paudgalika*)—that is to say, a monk should not inscribe his private property. This rule, of course, makes writing some of the sorts of inscriptions that we actually find—notably on the shards from the Buddhist levels at Mohenjo-daro—an offense, but it was clearly a minor offense, and such inscriptions are in any case surprisingly rare.²⁴

²⁴ For the shards from Mohenjo-daro see Ernest J.H. Mackay, *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro* (Delhi, 1938), 1: 187; see also Salomon 1999, 193 (*pot A* inscription) and 245 (the Kara Tepe example cited). There are some other possible examples but an explicit identification of the “owner” as a monk is generally lacking; e.g. S.R. Rao, “Excavations at Kanheri (1969),” in *Studies in Indian History and Culture*,

A second text from our *Vinaya* which deals with inscribing objects also deals with a potentially embarrassing situation for the monastic order. In this text²⁵ it is said that a householder had or owned two *vihāras*, a forest-*vihāra* and a village-*vihāra* (*khyim bdag geig la gtsug lag khang dgon pa dang/grong mtha' pa gnyis yod nas . . .*).²⁶ The village *vihāra* was well and abundantly furnished, but the forest-*vihāra* was not. On the occasion of a festival (*dus ston*) the forest monks wanted to borrow furnishings, bedding and seats, from the village monastery, but the village monks refused. The Buddha intervenes and orders that they must be lent. But the text does not end here, although a clear ruling has been established, because, it seems, the real issue has not yet been engaged.

The text goes on to say that at the end of the festival the forest monks thought to themselves: “This (forest)-*vihāra* too belongs to that (same) householder” (. . . *de dag gtsug lag khang 'di yang khyim bdag de'i yin no*), and they therefore did not return the goods. The Buddha again intervenes and declares—however surprisingly—“They must be brought back by force!” (*mithus dgug par bya'o, balād . . . grahanam*)—and there is absolutely no doubt that this is what the text says; the same exact expression is also used elsewhere in this Code in regard to the recovery of goods.²⁷

But the text even here is not yet finished, although a second clear and forceful ruling has also been established. The real issue comes—as it usually does in these texts—at the end. When the monks could not tell which goods belonged to what monastery, the text says:

The Blessed One said: “Write on them ‘these furnishings belong to the forest-monastery of the householder so-and-so,’ ‘this belongs to the village-monastery,’ and as these furnishings are clearly identified, so they are to be used!” (. . . *bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' tsal pa/gnas mal 'di ni khyim bdag che ge mo zhig gi dgon pa'i gtsug lag khang gi yin no/'di ni grong mtha'i gtsug lag khang gi yin no zhes yi ge bri zhing gnas mal ji ltar nges par byas pa bzhin du longs spyad par bya'o*).

edited by Shrinivas Ritti and B.R. Gopal (Dharwar, 1971), 45; Harry Falk, “Protective Inscriptions on Buddhist Monastic Implements,” in *Vividharathnakarandaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*. Indica et Tibetica 37, hg. Christine Chojnacki et al (Swisttal-Odendorf, 2000), 254, and the literature cited.

²⁵ *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 15a.3–15b.1, discussed already in Schopen 1996, 101–02 [= *BMBM*, 230–231].

²⁶ For another example of this state of affairs see *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 40.13: *anyatamena grhapatinā dvau vihārau kāritau eka āranyakānām dvītyo grāmāntikānām*.

²⁷ See Schopen 1996, 102 n. 44 [= *BMBM*, 231 n. 44].

Although the two texts so far cited occur in two completely different sections of our Code—one in the *Uttaragrantha* and the other in the *Vibhanga*—the second text is clearly a pendant to the first: the latter indicates that by monastic rule a monk’s private property should not be inscribed; the former that property belonging to a monastery should be. A third and here final text, however, goes beyond both. It rules that the name of the donor must be inscribed on the object given and, in fact, puts in the mouth of the Buddha himself a donative formula that is virtually identical to some of what we find in actual North Indian donative inscriptions. The text²⁸ says that after King Ajātaśatru, who had been mislead by the evil monk Devadatta, had killed his father he wept whenever he saw his father’s furnishings (*mal gos*). His advisers suggest that he should therefore give them to the Community of Monks, which he did. The monks, however, arranged them in the entrance hall (*sgo khang, dvārakoṣṭhaka*) of the monastery, and thus defeated the purpose since whenever the King visited the monastery he saw them and once again wept. The Buddha then said they must not be arranged in the entrance hall, so the monks first put them in an upper room (*yang thog, aṭṭāla*), but that did not work either, and so they put them in a residential cell (*gnas khang, layana*), and this turned out to be even worse. When “unbelievers” no longer saw the furnishings they began to criticize the Community, saying “since these monks have surely sold or made away with the King’s furnishings, merit from giving to them disappears!” (*ma dad pa dag gis rgyal po'i mal gos ni dge slong dag gis nges par btsongs te zos pas na/de ste phul ba'i bsod nams mi snang ngo zhes dpyas pa!*).²⁹ This, of course, will not do and the Buddha then ordered that the furnishings be periodically displayed, but this only served to confuse the Community’s critics since sometimes they saw the goods and sometimes they didn’t. This whole comedy of errors—and count-

²⁸ *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 154b.6–155a.6 = Tog Na 223a.5–223b.7.

²⁹ There is a significant difference between Derge and Tog in regard to the reading for the second half of this statement. Tog has *de ste phul ba'i bsod nams mi snang ngo zhes dpyas pa*, and I have adopted this here. Derge, however, reads *de sngon snang na da mi snang no zhes dpyas pa*, “since that which was formerly visible now is not.” It is possible that the reading in Derge was influenced by the reading in the corresponding passage in the very similar text that immediately follows (see n. 33 below) since there both Derge and Tog have: *snga na ni snang na da* [Tog *da ni*] *mi snang no zhes ḡhya ba* [Tog *dpyas pa*], but any satisfying resolution will have to wait for a proper edition of the text.

less texts in this *Vinaya* are structured as such—finally results in the definitive ruling. The Buddha, in the end, says simply to the monks: “You must write on the ends: ‘This thing is a religious gift of King Bimbisāra’ and display it!” (*yon du phul ba'i dngos po 'di ni rgyal po gzugs can snying po'i yin no zhes mtha' ma la yi ger bris te zhog shig/*).

Fortunately we have a Sanskrit text too for what the Buddha orders should be written. In his *Vinaya-sūtra*—a digest of our Code—Guṇaprabha gives it as *deyadharmaḥ yam amukasya*,³⁰ and—if we bracket the ever expanding “pious wishes”—this is almost exactly what we find, for example, on some of the inscribed pots recently published by Richard Salomon in his remarkable book on the British Library Scrolls: *[a]yam pānaya ghāḍe deyamdharme va[sa]vadatae susomabharyae. . .* “This waterpot is the pious gift of Vasavadata, wife of Susoma . . .,” or *aya pa[n]ya ghāḍae hastadatae teyavarmabharyae deyadharma. . .* “This waterpot is the pious gift of Hastadata . . . wife of Teyavarman. . .”³¹ This is also very much like what we find—as Gérard Fussman has shown—on the Shah-ji-ki Dheri casket inscription: *ayam gamdha-karamḍe deyadharma . . . mahasenasa samgharakṣidasa . . .* or on the Tōr Dherai shards, which share as well, as we have seen, a number of other features with our *Vinaya*: *shahi-yola-mirasya viharasvamisya deyadharma yam prapa. . .*³²

We have here, it seems, a remarkable congruence between text and epigraph, and yet another indication that what was stated as a Rule in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* was actually being practiced before, on, and after the cusp of our era in Northwest India. And a few further things might be noted here. First, it is immediately obvious that the “donative formula” found in the text is, by comparison with what occurs already in the earliest inscriptions, rather undeveloped, and this might suggest that the text is therefore even earlier. Second, it is clear, though probably not so obvious, that the text, though undeveloped, already carries the seed of what will grow into full-blown formulae for the “transfer of merit.” In the text it is explicitly indicated that the gift is actually given by Ajātaśatru, but the Buddha himself says that it should be inscribed as the gift of Bimbisāra,

³⁰ *Vinayasūtra* (Sankritayana) 119.2 = Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 98b. 3.

³¹ Salomon 1999, 198, 218.

³² Gérard Fussman, “Numismatic and Epigraphic Evidence for the Chronology of Early Gandharan Art,” in *Investigating Indian Art*, ed. M. Yaldiz & W. Lobo (Berlin, 1987), 79; Konow, in Stein 1929, 97.

his dead father. Indeed, given the ambiguity and over-lap between the genitive and dative cases not only in Sanskrit and Prakrit, but in Tibetan as well, the text could just as well be translated as “You must write on the ends: ‘This thing is a religious gift *for* King Bimbisāra.’” Finally, it is perhaps significant that the text I have treated here is not the only such text in our Code. Another very similar one in fact immediately follows it. The idea, it seems, was worth repeating.³³

What we have seen so far of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* would seem, then, to provide good grounds for asserting both a broad contemporaneity and a close if not intimate connection between much of what it contains and the religious world of Pre-Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇa North India that is reflected in the epigraphical and archeological records. This, of course, might not have been entirely unexpected. We know from even old inscriptions that the Sarvāstivādins were widely spread across Northwest India in these periods,³⁴ and our Code or *Vinaya* is by its title either “*the Original Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins*” or “*the Vinaya of the Original Sarvāstivādins*,” depending on how the compound is read. In fact the apparent contemporaneity between it and early Northwest practice may actually give substance to the claim embedded in its title.³⁵ But our Code in any case also pro-

³³ *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 155a.6–157a.2. This second text, in essentials very similar to the first although it contains as well a sermon on the inevitability of death, deals with the furnishings (again *mal gos*) of King Prasenajit’s grandmother (*phyi mo*) which he gave “to the Noble Community of the Jetavana” (the same narrative frame is used at Pāli *Vinaya* ii 169.29 to a different end). In this instance, however, the ‘inscription’ that is to be written is *yul ko sha la’i ryal po gsal ryal gyis phul ba’i [mal] gos*, “furnishings that were given by Prasenajit, King of Kośala”. It, then, does not use a pronoun (*’di, ayam*), nor an expression like *yon du phul ba’i dngos po* or *shyin par bya ba’i chos* (*deyadharma*—so *Vinayasūtra*), and so is even less developed. It also names as the donor the actual giver of the property (Prasenajit), and not its previous and now deceased owner (Prasenajit’s grandmother).

³⁴ Already noted in André Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule* (Paris, 1955), 36, 131–132, and the sources cited; Lamotte 1958, 578; and repeated recently in Charles Willemen et al, *Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Scholasticism* (Leiden, 1998), 103–104; 115–116. Inscriptions from the Northwest that refer to the Sarvāstivādins, moreover, continue to be published. See Salomon 1999, 200 (pot B), 205 (pot C).

³⁵ For some examples of the attempts to sort out the relationship(s) between the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins see J.W. de Jong, “Les *sūtrapiṭaka* des sarvāstivādin et des mūlasarvāstivādin,” in *Mélanges d’indianisme a la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris, 1968), 395–402; Biswadeb Mukherjee, “On the Relationship between the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya,” *Journal of Asian Studies* (Madras) 2.1 (1984) 139–65; B. Mukherjee, “Shih-sung-lu and the Reconstruction

vides us with a glimpse into the Buddhist monastic world out of which it comes, and already indicates how far removed this world is from the one presented in popular works and textbooks, and even in otherwise good scholarly work. The Buddhist monk we see even in the few passages so far cited from this Code has in fact very little in common with the Buddhist monk who lives in the western imagination—the ascetic monk who wanders alone “like a rhinoceros” in the forest, sits at the root of a tree in deep meditation, and has cut all ties with the world. If this monk ever existed, by the time of our Code he would certainly have been very much of an exception, and by no means a popular one.

Forty years ago André Bareau said not just about our Code but all Buddhist monastic Codes “... it is true that the *Vinayapiṭakas* do not breathe a word about the numerous spiritual practices, meditations, contemplations, etc., which constituted the very essence of the Buddhist ‘religion.’”³⁶ And although this is something of an exaggeration, still it should have given all pause for thought. Our Code, for example, does refer to ascetic, meditating monks, but when it does so in any detail such monks almost always appear as the butt of jokes, objects of ridicule, and, not uncommonly, sexual deviants.³⁷ They are presented as irresponsible and of the type that gives the Order a bad name.³⁸ There are texts in our Code where, for example, ascetic, cemetery-monks only manage to terrify children;³⁹ where ascetic monks who wear robes made from cemetery cloth are not even allowed into the monastery, let alone allowed to sit on a mat that belongs to the Community;⁴⁰ tales where the only point seems

of the Original Sarvāstivāda Vinaya,” *Buddhist Studies* 15 (1991) 46–52; Willemen et al 1998, 36–137; F. Enomoto, “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin’, in Chojnacki 2000, 239–250. Willemen et al referring to work by Przyluski, Hofinger and Bareau, say on p. 87: “Comparative studies of the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Sarvāstivādins and of the Mūlasarvāstivādins reveal that what was later called the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinya* is older than the *Sarvāstivādavinya*, and even older than most other *Vinayapiṭakas*.

³⁶ André Bareau, “Le construction et le culte des stūpa d’après les vinayapiṭaka,” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 244.

³⁷ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 102a.5–104b.2.

³⁸ *Posadhadavastu*, (Hu-von Hinüber) §§ 6.1–8.

³⁹ *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 154b.2–156b.7.

⁴⁰ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 222b.2–224b.1. Both this passage and the *Vibhaṅga* passage of n.39 are more fully discussed in Gregory Schopen, “Cross-dressing with the Dead: Asceticism, Ambivalence, and Institutional Values in an Indian Monastic Code,” in *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, ed. Brian J. Cuevas and Jacqueline Stone, forthcoming.

to be to indicate that meditation makes you stupid;⁴¹ texts about monks who meditate in the forest who cannot control their male member and so end up smashing it between two rocks—whereupon the Buddha tells them, while they are howling in pain, that they, unfortunately, have smashed the wrong thing: they should have smashed desire.⁴² There is a tale about another monk who meditated in the forest and, to avoid being seduced by a goddess, had to tie his legs shut (!) The goddess being put off by this then flings him through the air and he lands, legs still tied, on top of the King who is sleeping on the roof of his palace. The King, of course, is not amused, and makes it known to the Buddha that it will not do to have his monks being flung around the countryside in the middle of the night. The Buddha then actually makes a rule forbidding monks to meditate in the forest!⁴³ Texts and tales of this sort are very numerous in our Code.

The monks our Code is concerned with are of a very different sort as, again, even our very brief survey indicates. In the passages so far cited we find monks who have servants and who do not even have to wash their own dishes. Monks who eat fine meals in the homes of prominent laymen; monks who are concerned not about meditation, but with property, with marking and maintaining control or possession of property, and who have and acknowledge personal property. Moreover, the monks our Code is concerned with live, whether in the forest or the village, in monasteries that were owned by laymen. It is becoming ever clearer on the basis of this Code that that meant they were in at least some important ways in the employ of their donors. There are rules in this Code that require, for example, that monks, regardless of their own wishes, must spend a part of each day in any *vihāra* that has been “donated” to insure that none stands empty, that all are used, and thus continue to earn merit for their owner, even if a single monk has to move from one

⁴¹ *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 79b.7–80b.3 = *Diṭṭhīvadāna* (Cowell & Neil) 504.25–505.29.

⁴² *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 39a.6–39b.5.

⁴³ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Da 35b.2–36a.2; the *Posadhadavastu* passage cited in n. 38 above also explicitly forbids practicing meditation in the forest: *bhagavān āha/nāranye yogo bhāvayitavyah* (§ 6.5).

to another in the course of the same day.⁴⁴ There are rules that require the monks to recite verses every day for the merit of not only the owner of the monastery, but each and every donor or benefactor, and each of their individual names must every day be announced—this in a monastery of any size could easily have taken up a significant part of the day.⁴⁵ There was, however, an even more serious problem in this “employment,” a systemic problem of far reaching consequences that involved our monks—and very early on it seems—in money transactions, sophisticated financial enterprises, the promotion of “art,” and extensive fund raising projects. It created situations that—for example—the administrators of the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, or any institution, might find uncomfortably familiar.

The problem most simply put was this: whereas, as we have seen, the obligations of the monks who lived in their monasteries were reasonably clear and enforceable, the obligations of the owner or donors were much less so. Aspects of the problem are repeatedly addressed in our Code, particularly the problems of the maintenance and upkeep of the “physical plant” and the subsistence of its residents. The problem of monasteries falling into disrepair is explicitly raised, for example, in the *Śayanāsanavastu*, “the Section on Bedding and Seats” in our Code, but the solution proposed there must have been something less than satisfying. There the Buddha says:

The donor should be encouraged to make repairs (*dānapatir utsāhayitavyah*). If just that succeeds, it is good. If it does not succeed then they are to be repaired with Community assets (*sāṅghika*). If that is not possible, in so far as it is possible, to that extent restoration is to be done. The rest must be tolerated (*anye vyupekṣitavyāḥ*).⁴⁶

Passages of this sort suggest that the redactors of our Code understood that “donors” were not strictly speaking obliged to maintain their monasteries, and could only be encouraged to do so. But they also suggest that there was an awareness, if not an expectation, that

⁴⁴ *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 35.1–10; the passage is translated and discussed in Schopen 1996, 113–114ff [= BMBM, 238–239]. Note in particular n. 65 there where the corresponding passage in the *Vinayasūtra* is also translated.

⁴⁵ *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 71b.4–74a.2, translated and discussed in Schopen 1998, 173–178ff [= BMBM, 270–275].

⁴⁶ *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 35.7; Schopen 1996, 113 [= BMBM, 238].

they might not. Other passages in this same *Vastu*, however, suggest as well that in regard to the related problem of subsistence the monks might vote, as it were, with their feet.

In one such passage,⁴⁷ for example, a householder goes to a monastery and hears the Elder of the Community reciting verses and “assigning the reward or merit” (*dakṣiṇām ādiśat*) to its deceased (*abhyatītakālagata*) donors.⁴⁸ He says to the monk: “Noble One, if I have a *vihāra* built would you assign the merit to my name also?” (*ārya yady aham vihāram kārayāmi mamāpi nāmnā dakṣiṇām uddiśasi*). The monk says he will, and the householder has a *vihāra* built, “but he gave nothing to it and it remained unoccupied” (*tatrānena na kīmcid dattam sa śūnya evāvasthitah*). The householder sees this and goes to complain to the monk: “Noble One,” he says, “my *vihāra* (*madīyo vihārah*) remains empty. No monk resides there.” The monk says: “Sir, it should be made productive (*utsvedya*).” The householder initially misunderstands this euphemism and says “But, Noble One, it was built on sterile saline soil. How is it to be made productive?” To which the Monk says: “Householder, I did not mean that, but rather that there was no donation (*lābha*) there.” The householder says: “Noble One, who now resides in my *vihāra* (*madīye vihāre*), to him I will present cloth.”

Monks could, then, in effect try to force the owner of a *vihāra* to provide for their maintenance by withdrawing or refusing to provide their services, but this, of course, could be a two-edged sword, and if they tried it they could find themselves not only out of business, but also without a home. Moreover, yet another structural weakness arose from the fact that donors—like the rest of us—died, and the redactors of our Code were clearly aware of what this could mean.

⁴⁷ *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 37.6–38.13; translated in full at Schopen 1996, 92–93 [= *BM* 225–226].

⁴⁸ Both Vinītadeva’s *Vinayavibhāṅgapadādayākhyāna* (Derge, btsan ’gyur, ’dul ba Tshu 64b.5) and Śilapālita’s *Āgamaśudrakāyākhyāna* (Derge, btsan ’gyur, ’dul ba Dzu 73a.5) make it clear that the Mūlasarvāstivādin commentarial tradition understood *dakṣiṇām ādiśi* or *udādiśi* to mean the “assigning” or “transfer” of merit. The first, commenting on *Vibhāṅga*, Derge Ca 154a.5, says: *yon bshad pa zhes bya ba ni shyin pa'i 'bras bu yongs su bsngu ba'o*, “‘Assigning the reward’ means: transferring the fruit of the gift”; and the second, commenting on *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 237a.5, says: *yon bsngu ba ni chos kyi shyin pa la sogs pa las yang dag par byung ba'i bsod nams kyi 'bras bu kun du [rd: tu] bgo bsha' byad [rd: byed] pa'o*, “‘assigning the reward’ means: apportioning the fruit of the merit which arises from a religious gift, etc.”

More than one text in our Code begins with just such a situation. In the *Vinayavibhanga*, in a passage we will return to, we find, for example:⁴⁹

A devout and good householder with meritorious inclinations lived in a rural hamlet. He had a *vihāra* for the Community built in the forest that had lofty gateways and was ornamented with open galleries on the roof, latticed windows, and railings. It captivated both the heart and eye, was like a stairway to the heavens, and had exquisite couches, benches, and furnishings.⁵⁰ The householder provided robes, alms, and all the needs of the sixty monks who lived there.

But later that householder died. Since he had a son the monks went to him and said: “Seeing, Sir, that your father had provided robes, alms and all the needs of sixty monks, are you able as well to provide us, the sixty monks, with robes, alms and all our needs?”

The son said: “Noble Ones, while there are some who might look after a hundred, a thousand, or even a hundred thousand, since there are others, myself included, who have difficulty making ends meet, I am not able to do it.”

The monks then left that *vihāra*.

In the event of a donor’s death, then, the lack of clarity in regard to his obligations while alive became even more pronounced in regard to the donor’s heirs. The text here suggests that the redactors of our Code considered that the initial response of the monks to such an event should be to approach the heir or heirs to get a confirmation that any arrangement that the donor had entered into would continue. But it also suggests that there was a clear awareness that the heirs might—and had the right to—simply terminate any such arrangement. In fact the death of an owner or donor created a very awkward situation. The obligations of the monks to a dead donor had been put unequivocally into the Buddha’s mouth: “The Blessed One said: ‘Merit must be transferred to donors who have passed away and are dead!’” (*uktam bhagavatā abhyatītakālagatānāṁ dānapatīnāṁ nāmnā dakṣinā ādeśtavyā iti*).⁵¹ He had been made to declare just as explicitly that all *vihāras* must be used. But without some provision having been made for the maintenance of both the physical monastery and any resident monks neither would have been possible after the

⁴⁹ *Vibhanga*, Derge Cha 184a.l.

⁵⁰ On this description of, and emphasis on, a beautiful *vihāra* see below 307ff and n. 60.

⁵¹ *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 37.6.

donors' death, in spite of the fact that donors might have acted on the expectation that it would. The redactors of our Code, moreover, would have us believe that this concern was in fact explicitly articulated by donors themselves, and that it was in response to their voiced concern that the monks had begun to accept considerable sums as "permanent endowments," and to lend those sums out on interest. At least this is how these practices were justified in one of the two texts in our *Vinaya* which deal with them.

The *Vibhanga* text in question, which has been treated in some detail elsewhere, opens by saying:⁵²

At that time the Licchavis of Vaiśālī built houses with six or seven upper chambers. As the Licchavis built their houses, so too did they build *vihāras*. . . . As a consequence, because of their great height . . . they fell apart. When that occurred the donors thought: "If even the *vihāras* of those who are still living . . . fall thus into ruin, how will it be for the *vihāras* of those who are dead? We should give a perpetuity to the monastic Community for building purposes."

They do so, and then encourage the suitably reluctant monks to lend out on interest the sums they were given as endowments. The monks ask the Buddha and the Buddha says: "For the sake of the Community a perpetuity for building purposes must be lent out on interest." A little later in the text this directive is extended to perpetuities for the benefit of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Community. The text then concludes with one of the more remarkable pieces of *buddhavacana* that we have, a saying of the Buddha giving detailed instructions on how to make a loan and how to write a written loan contract:

The Blessed One said: "Taking a pledge of twice the value (of the loan), and writing out a contract which has a seal and is witnessed, the perpetuity is to be placed. In the contract the year, the month, the day, the name of the Elder of the Community, the Provost of the Monastery, the borrower, the property, and the interest should be recorded. When the perpetuity is to be placed, that pledge of twice the value is also to be placed with a trustworthy lay-brother who has undertaken the five rules of training.

⁵² *Vibhanga*, Derge Cha 154b.3. For a more detailed treatment of the passage see Schopen, "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994): 527–554 [= *BMBM*, 45–90].

Such a financial instrument or legal device is, of course, at least one viable solution to the problem of institutional maintenance over time and this sort of thing—like the legal concept of a “juristic personality”—was very likely pioneered by Buddhist monastic communities. There is in fact inscriptional evidence for the use of such instruments by Buddhist monastic communities from as early as, perhaps, the 1st Century of the Common Era, but unfortunately not from the Northwest.⁵³ This fact, however, must be tempered by the further fact that records of endowments or land grants, for example, are extremely rare—if they occur at all—in the Pre-Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇa epigraphical record from the Northwest. If such transactions occurred there, and it is hard to imagine that they did not, it appears that they were simply not recorded in inscriptions.

But in addition to permanent endowments and to lending money on interest, our Code also suggests that the monastic communities it knew or envisioned could also borrow money. We know this from a remarkable provision of what can only be called Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic inheritance law. Since the text involved is a short one and until recently virtually unknown it might be quoted here in full:⁵⁴

The setting was in Śrāvastī.

A monk who was the Service Manager (*zhal ta byed pa, vaiyāprtyakara*) borrowed money (*nor*) from a householder for the sake of the Community and then died. When the householder heard that that monk had died he went to the *vihāra* and asked: “Where is the monk so-and-so?”

The monks said: “He’s dead.”

The householder said: “But, Noble Ones, he borrowed some money from me.”

“Well go and collect it from him then!” the monks said.

“But since it was not for the sake of his parents or himself, but for the sake of the Community that he took it, you should repay it!”

⁵³ See, for references, Schopen 1994, 532 ns. 22–25 [= *BMBM*, 52 ns. 22–25], to which might be added B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao et al., *Buddhist Inscriptions of Andhra* (Secunderabad, 1998), 192 “Patagandigudem (Kallacheruvu) Copper Plates of Siri Ehāvala Chāntamūla.” This record was apparently discovered only in 1997 and is potentially very important. It is the only copper-plate inscription of the Ikṣvāku so far known, and is the only record so far of a grant of land by an Ikṣvāku king to a Buddhist monastic community. A far better treatment of it is now available in Harry Falk, “The Pātagandīḍēm copper-plate grant of the Ikṣvāku king Ehavala Cāntamūla,” *Silk Road Art and Archeology* 6 (1999/2000): 275–283.

⁵⁴ *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 196a.7. For a discussion of the text see now Gregory Schopen, “Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001): 115–18 [= *BMBM*, 136–140].

The monks reported to the Blessed One what had occurred and the Blessed One said: “If it is known that he took it for the sake of the Community, then the Community must repay the loan! I, monks, will here give the rules of customary behavior for a monk like the Monk in Charge of Construction (*las gsar du byed pa, navakarmika*): When the Monk in Charge of Construction has asked the various Seniors (*rgan pa*), then he must take out loans! If Monks in Charge of Construction do not act in accordance with the rules of customary behavior they come to be guilty of an offence.”

Here we have put into the mouth of the Buddha—the same Buddha who is said to have declared that “all things are impermanent”—specific instructions detailing how a monastic officer must, after consultation with the senior monks, take out a loan from a layman for the use of the monastic community. Obviously, if we chose, as most scholars have, to take the one type of declaration seriously, but the other not, then we are going to be in no position to fully understand the buildings that followers of that same Buddha built, nor the pots they used, nor the money that they handled. Indeed there may be for us a further cautionary tale in the fact that the *navakarmika*, the monk who is not only in charge of construction but who is also to take out loans, is very probably the earliest monastic officer for which we have epigraphical evidence,⁵⁵ and in the fact that just such an officer is mentioned in four separate Pre- and Early-Kuṣāṇa Kharoṣṭī inscriptions from the Northwest.⁵⁶

To this point, then, it seems that we can at least conclude that the redactors of our Code, who very probably lived in Early Northwest India, were looking for ways, and devising means, to secure access to funds and reliable sources of income that would insure the continuation of the institution to which they belonged, and the maintenance of the physical plants that housed it. In the process they—like so many successful fundraisers who came after them—seem to have discovered what St. Bernard in 11th century France still found disconcerting. Bernard did not like elaborate monastic architecture, nor art in monasteries. He particularly did not like what he thought

⁵⁵ Its only possible competitor would be the office of *bhatutesaka* which is referred to in a single inscription from Bhārhut (H. Lüders, *Bharhut Inscriptions. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* II.2, ed. E. Waldschmidt & M.A. Mehendale (Ootacamund, 1963), 20, A 17.

⁵⁶ Konow 1927, XIII, LXXII, LXXVI, LXXXII; see also Schopen 1997, 159, 190–91 and notes.

other monks used them for. He argued, in fact, that art and fine architecture were being used to attract donations to the monasteries, and he thought that because, very probably, they were. But in his exasperation he said: “In this way wealth is derived from wealth, in this way money attracts money, because by I know not what law, wherever the more riches are seen, there the more willingly are offerings made.”⁵⁷ This same principle, or quirk of human psychology, seems, as I have already said, to already have been discovered by the redactors of our Code. They at least included in their compilation a very significant number of texts which suggest that. Here we can only look at a few.

Our Code refers to beautiful monasteries in beautiful settings, to paintings on monastery walls and on cloth, and to a very specific image type, one example of which, from Sahri-Bahlol, must surely be one of the most beautiful images in all of Gandhāran art.⁵⁸ But in virtually every case these references also refer—in one way or another—to the gifts and donations that such things generate. Even in a case that might at first sight seem to be an exception to this it turns out to be true. In a text that we have already seen, for example, an elaborate monastery with “lofty gateways and ornamented with open galleries on the roof,” a monastery explicitly said to “capture both the heart and the eye,” is abandoned after the death of its donor. But not—the text goes on to say—for long. When “merchants from the North Country” see this beautiful monastery and discover its monks have left, they promptly re-endow it on an even more lavish scale. They say to two old monks that they found there:⁵⁹

“Noble Ones, here is alms for three months for sixty monks. Here is alms for the festival of the eighth day, and for the fourteenth day, and the fifteenth day. Here are the requisites for medicines for the sick, a general donation, the price for robes. . . . When the rainy season is over we will return and provide for the needs of a hundred monks.”

⁵⁷ Conrad Rudolph, *The “Things of Greater Moment”. Bernard of Clairvaux’s *Apologia* and the Medieval Attitude Toward Art* (Philadelphia, 1990), 280–281, for both the Latin text and the translation cited here. For another translation see Michael Casey & Jean Leclercq, *Cistercians and Cluniacs. St. Bernard’s *Apologia* to Abbot William* (Kalamazoo, 1970), 65; see also Peter Fergusson, *Architecture of Solitude. Cistercian Abbeys in Twelfth-Century England* (Princeton, 1984), 11–14.

⁵⁸ See below, n. 77.

⁵⁹ *Vibhanga*, Derge Cha 184a. 1.

Narratively, the merchants can only be responding to the beauty and elaborate character of the monastery, not to what the monks are or do. There are in fact no permanent resident monks, and this interpretation is, as we will see, explicitly confirmed elsewhere. The message here in a tale told by monks to other monks must have been clear: If you want to have a monastery that can survive the death of its donor, then it too must be capable of captivating the heart and the eye—not, be it noticed, the head.⁶⁰ In fact such monasteries were thought not only to survive, but to have been inordinately prosperous. That at least is the substance of another text which describes in some detail the kinds of wealth that are found in a beautiful *vihāra*. There even the cells of new novices have cloth racks “hung and heaped with cloth;” the Community has a great deal of “bedding and seats” and even new novices, again, get seven sorts; and the monks’ cells are full of copper vessels.⁶¹ Beauty, it seems, in part at least means over abundance, and the association between the two is not made by us, but by the redactors of our Code. A third text that refers to such a monastery typifies a whole series of such texts and confirms our initial observation. It is of additional interest because it contains the authorization for monks to maintain stores of rice and to get into the rice selling business.

The text in question is so straightforward as to be startling. In it “some merchants from the northern road” were traveling⁶²

. . . they saw *vihāras* which had high arched gateways, were ornamented with windows, latticed windows and railings, *vihāras* that captivated the

⁶⁰ This description of a beautiful *vihāra* is so common in our *Vinaya* that it constitutes a cliché; for some other examples, some of which will be cited immediately below, see *Vibhanga*, Derge, Ca 153b.3; Cha 148b.2; 156b.4; Nya 141a.6; 146b.4, 147b.3; *Pravrajāvastu* (Eimer) ii 271.8; 273.12; etc. The last two of these are particularly interesting examples which combine the description of a beautiful *vihāra* with another formula, discussed below, that describes the natural beauty of a park in spring; both also contain a further characterization of the *vihāra* as *lha'i gnas ltar dpal gyis 'bar ba*. Happily we also have a Sanskrit version of this simile: *devabhavanam iva śriyā jālantam*, “like the dwelling of a god, shining with splendor”—this is a remarkable figure of speech to apply to a Buddhist monastery (see Volkbert Näther et al., “The Final Leaves of the *Pravrajāvastu* Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript Found near Gilgit. Part I *Samgharaksitāvadāna*,” in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen III. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*. Beiheft 6, Bearbeitet von G. Bongrad-Levin et al. (Göttingen, 1996), 255.33).

⁶¹ *Vibhanga*, Derge Ca 153b.1ff.

⁶² *Vibhanga*, Derge Cha 156b.4.

eye and heart and were like stairways to heaven, and they were deeply affected (*dad par 'gyur te, prasanna*). They went to a *vihāra* and said to the monks: “Noble Ones, we would make an offering feast (*mchod ston*) for the Community!”

The point here is probably hard to miss. Here the merchants are explicitly presented as responding to the appearance of the monastery, and to that alone. They are moved by its beauty, their heart and eye stolen. The Sanskrit here was certainly either *prasanna* or *abhiprasanna* and it repeatedly occurs in our passages to express an emotional state or aesthetic reaction. It is a term like *saṃvega*, which occurs in some of the same contexts, in spite of how it has sometimes been translated, and in our texts this aesthetic reaction almost invariably results, as we will see, in donations.⁶³ But our text also goes on to indicate that attracting donors can also involve complications.

When the merchants have declared their intentions to the monks, the monks tell them to bring what is needed for the meal, but the merchants say they have only just arrived and they would prefer to give the price to the monks and then the monks can provide the rice. The monks demur, but the Buddha then gives a first directive: “When someone makes an offering feast for the sake of the Community you must sell them rice!” (… *rin gyis 'bras sbyin par bya'o*). The monks do so, but when “large numbers” made such feasts and the monks sold to all of them “the common stores were exhausted,” and the Buddha gives a second set of directives which constitute, in effect, guidelines for running an efficient granary—i.e., he directs that when rice is sold for a feast in the same *vihāra* a little something extra might be given for the price; that old rice must be sold at “a good time” and the storerooms filled with new rice, etc. Clearly, the monks who redacted our Code realized that being in one business, the business of attracting donors, required engaging in other businesses as well, like buying and selling grain.

But if these and other texts like them in our *Vinaya* link beautiful and imposing monastic architecture with the attraction of donations,

⁶³ For the richness of the terms *prasanna* and *abhiprasanna* see, for now, Schopen 1996, 98–99 and n. 39 [= *BMBM*, 228–229 & n. 39]; and note, for now, that there is almost certainly a connection between the Buddhist use of these terms in the context of donations and the dharmaśāstric notion of “tokens of affection” (*prasāda*) as a distinct category of property that is excluded from partition. For some examples of the latter see Ludo & Rosane Rocher, “Ownership by Birth: The Mitākṣarā Stand,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29 (2001): 247–48.

still others articulate, in addition, a linkage between donations and the natural beauty of a monastery's setting. One example will suffice. In the Chapter on Robes we find:⁶⁴

There was a householder in a rural hamlet. He had a *vihāra* made, but only one monk entered into the rainy season retreat there. That monk, however, was energetic. Every day he smeared that *vihāra* with cow-dung and swept it well. Well maintained was that *vihāra*, and sited in a lovely isolated spot adorned with all sorts of trees, filled with the soft sounds of geese and curlews, peacocks and parrots, mainas and cuckoos, adorned with various flowers and fruits.

Once a very wealthy trader spent the night in that *vihāra*. When he saw the beauties of that *vihāra* (*vihāraśobham*), and the beauties of its woods (*upavanaśobham*), he was deeply moved (*abhiprasanna*), and although he had not seen the monks, he dispatched in the name of the Community a very considerable donation (*prabhūto lābhaḥ*).

This little text too probably requires little commentary, in part because in both its structure and its basic vocabulary it repeats the others we have seen, and in part because it is so clear. There are of course “new” elements of interest, but the basic account is what might already be called “the same old story.” A wealthy merchant comes to a *vihāra* and when he *sees* its beauties he is struck, moved, or affected—once again the term is *abhiprasanna*—and he makes a large donation. What is different here is that although, again, the *vihāra* itself is attractive, the emphasis is not so much on it, as on what might be called the aesthetics of order and cleanliness and the beauty of its setting. If the early Northwest was anything like modern India it is not difficult to see how a clean and well maintained monastery might well make a distinct impression. But the natural beauty of the site itself is most fully described and it is this, perhaps, that our redactors want most to emphasize. The site of the monastery is here described very much in the same terms that our Code repeatedly uses to describe the natural beauties of a park or garden (*udyāna*) in spring, and thereby assimilates the two.⁶⁵ Though oddly little studied, Indian literature—both religious and secular—is saturated with thick and sensuous descriptions of such “parks” and they clearly had strong aesthetic appeal. Western archeologists from Cunningham to

⁶⁴ *Cīvara-vastu*, GMs iii 2, 107.11.

⁶⁵ *Saṅghabhedavastu* (Gnoli) ii 109.10; 121.5; *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 32.3; etc.

Stein have also repeatedly remarked on the sometimes stunning natural beauty of the sites of Buddhist monasteries, and our text would seem to indicate that their selection was almost certainly not accidental.⁶⁶ Apart from these considerations we perhaps need only note here that our text makes very explicit what in the previous texts was only strongly implied: this merchant was responding solely and simply to the beauties of the *vihāra* and its setting. The text explicitly says that he never even saw the monks.

Having seen what we have in the discussion of our texts so far, when we get to what we call “art” there are no surprises. As Zürcher and others have noted, our monastic Code is comparatively rich in references to “art,” although the “art” it refers to is predominately painting.⁶⁷ Here I must limit myself to some brief remarks on two such texts whose basic point will sound perfectly familiar.

One of the texts on monastic art in our Code has been known for some time now. It deals with the famous lay brother Anāthapindāda seeking and gaining permission from the Buddha to have paintings in the equally famous monastery that he “donated” to the Order.⁶⁸ The language that he is made to use, and the reasons he is made to give for wanting paintings in the monastery are particularly interesting but can, of course, only be securely attributed to the monk or monks who composed or redacted the text. They, or Anāthapindāda, did not, according to the text, want art in the monastery to instruct either the laity or the monks, nor to serve as objects of devotion, nor as aids to meditation. They or him wanted this art for a very different reason, and the text here too seems to be remarkably straightforward. It begins:

⁶⁶ Alexander Cunningham, *The Bhilsa Topes or Buddhist Monuments of Central India* (London, 1854), 320–321; Aurel Stein, *On Alexander's Track to the Indus* (London, 1929), 17–18; 35.

⁶⁷ See Erik Zürcher, “Buddhist Art in Medieval China: The Ecclesiastical View,” in *Function and Meaning in Buddhist Art. Proceedings of a Seminar held at Leiden University 21–24 October 1991*, ed. K.R. van Kooij & H. Van der Veere (Groningen, 1995), 1–20, esp. 6; and before him Alexander Coburn Soper, “Early Buddhist Attitudes Towards the Art of Painting,” *The Art Bulletin* 32 (1950): 147–51; Paul Demiéville, “Butsuzō,” *Hōbōgirin*, troisième fascicule (Paris, 1974), 210ff.

⁶⁸ For the account of the founding of this famous monastery in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, and on the distinct possibility that the purchase of its site by Anāthapindāda was highly illegal, see Gregory Schopen, “Heirarchy and Housing in a Buddhist Monastic Code. A Translation of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śayanāśanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. Part One,” *Buddhist Literature* 2 (2001): 92–196.

When the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had given the Jetavana Monastery to the Community from the Four Directions it occurred to him then: “Since there are no paintings this monastery is ugly (*di ri mo ma bris pas mi sdug ste*). If, therefore, the Blessed One were to authorize it, it should have paintings.” So thinking he went to the Blessed One and sat down at one side. So seated the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said this to the Blessed One: “Reverend, the Jetavana is ugly because I did not have paintings made. Therefore, if the Blessed One were to authorize it, I will have paintings made there.”

The Blessed One said: “Householder, with my authorization paintings therefore must be made!”⁶⁹

As if to make sure that no one missed the point the redactors repeat it twice: There should be paintings in the monastery because without them it is ugly or not beautiful. And no other reason is here given.⁷⁰ The text continues with the Buddha giving specific instructions on the placement of specific paintings—the Great Miracle and the Wheel of Rebirth are to be painted on the porch; the garland of *Jātakas* on the gallery; a *yakṣa* holding a club at the door of the Buddha’s shrine; the various Elders in the meeting hall, etc.⁷¹ This

⁶⁹ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 225a.3ff. Though much of this account, found in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, was summarized or partly translated already by both W. Woodville Rockhill (*The Life of the Buddha* [London, 1907], 48 n. 2) and Marcelle Lalou (“Notes sur la décoration des monastères bouddhiques,” *Revue des arts asiatiques* 5.3 [1930]: 183–185), this important opening paragraph was entirely ignored.

⁷⁰ Virtually this same reason, and it alone, is repeatedly given elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* to justify several significant elements of both *stūpas* and images, and several elements of the ritual activity directed toward them. In the *Uttaragrantha*, for example, when Anāthapiṇḍada has a *stūpa* built for the hair and nails of the Blessed One, and “when, because it was not plastered, it was ugly (*mi mdzes pa*)”, he then seeks and receives permission to have it plastered, repeating in full the reason: “so long as it remains unplastered it is ugly (*mi mdzes pa*)”. In the same way it is said that a *stūpa* is not beautiful when there are no lamps, when the railing surrounding it has no gateway (*rta babs = torana*), when flowers given to it wither, etc., and in each case this aesthetic consideration, and it alone, results in the Blessed One ordering that this aesthetic deficiency be remedied, that *stūpas* be provided with lamps, their railings be provided with *toranas*, etc (see *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 114a.3ff; 120b.1. A fuller summary of these passages, not always fully dependable, can be found in Pema Dorjee, *Stupa and its Technology. A Tibeto-Buddhist Perspective* [New Delhi, 1996], 4–7. Dorjee paraphrases *mi mdzes par gyur na/nas* as “would appear unattractive,” “did not look nice,” “looked unattractive”). The same ‘argument’, using the same language, is also used to justify providing “the image of the Bodhisattva” (*byang chub sems dpa'i gzugs*; i.e. of Siddhārtha) with ornaments, carrying the image on a wagon, providing that wagon with flags, banners, etc. In each case, again, it is said that the reason for doing so was so that the image or processional wagon would not be ugly (*mi mdzes pa*)—*Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 137b.4ff.

⁷¹ We have a digest of this part of the text preserved in Sanskrit. See *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 114.16–31.

much of the tradition has been known, if not fully appreciated, for some time. But an equally important text related to the paintings in the Jetavana that occurs in the same section of our Code has gone completely unnoticed. Its purport will be almost immediately familiar:⁷²

After the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had “given” the Jetavana Monastery to the Community of Monks from the Four Directions, and had had it finished both inside and out with various sorts of colors, and had had paintings done, then crowds of people who lived in Śrāvastī heard how the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had finished the Jetavana both inside and out with various sorts of colors and paintings, and had made it remarkably fine, and many hundreds of thousands of people came then to see the Jetavana.

The text to this point is not subtle and it is hard to imagine that any monk who was in charge of a monastery could miss the point: People would hear about a monastery that had paintings, and they would come—in very large numbers. But the rest of the text is no more subtle. It concerns a brahman from Śrāvastī to whom, the text says, “The king and his ministers and the local people were much devoted”—paintings will apparently not just attract people, but the better sort as well. The text says that this brahman had received from the royal court “an extremely costly woolen blanket” (*chen po la 'os pa'i la ba*), and then—by now almost predictably:⁷³

Once when he was wearing that blanket he went to the Jetavana to see its wonders (*ltad mo, kūtahala*). Just as soon as he saw it he was greatly moved (*dad pa chen po skyes nas*) and he gave that woolen blanket to the Community of Monks from the Four Directions.

The first thing to note is that here we again have a text that makes explicit what is only strongly implied in others: The presence of things beautiful—paintings which are explicitly said to be “a wonder” or “marvel”—attract people. Here it is explicitly said that the brahman went to the monastery to *see* “its wonders,” not, again be it noted, to see the Buddha or the monks or hear the Dharma. Apart from this we see only what we have already seen before: An individual sees what is beautiful, is deeply moved, and makes a large donation. It is the donation that the text is in fact most interested in; its value

⁷² *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 262b.4.

⁷³ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 262b.7.

is explicitly stated: The blanket was not only a royal gift but is also explicitly described as “extremely costly.” Its value is further emphasized by the fact that as the text continues the brahman tries to get it back! And it is even more strongly emphasized by the further fact that its donation requires and effects a significant change in established monastic rules. Prior to this occasion the rule established by the Buddha was that all cloth donated to the Community must be cut up and divided equally among the monks.⁷⁴ But the donation of this costly cloth led the Buddha himself to modify that rule—to, it is easy to see, the material benefit of the monks. He is made to rule: “Henceforth, monks, whatever donation of cloth of this sort falls to the Community must be sold for cash (*kārṣāpāṇa*) and the cash divided among the monks (*de lta bas na dge 'dun la gos kyi myed pa de lta bu grub pa gang yin pa de kar sha pa na dag tu bsgyur la kar sha pa na dag bgo bar bya'o*). This ruling which *requires* the monks to engage in commercial transactions and act as cloth merchants is, in fact, the main point of the entire account. But with monks selling cloth and buying and selling rice and a whole host of other such activities, it is hardly surprising, then, that large numbers of coins have been found at Buddhist monastic sites.

These texts dealing with the paintings in the Jetavana are probably the most important texts in our Code dealing with monastic art. There are, of course, others, but there is little point in treating them in detail. They all, in one way or another, tell the same story. The well known text dealing with the Wheel of Rebirth painted on the porch of the Jetavana is, in the end, about the donation of a monastic feast that cost five hundred *kārṣāpāṇas*, in spite of the fact that the painting was originally intended for didactic purposes or to frighten the monks.⁷⁵ The account of the painted image of the Buddha on cloth that was sent to a Sri Lankan princess is, in the end, about a magnificent donation of pearls which provided one of the occasions on which the Buddha himself defined the threefold economic

⁷⁴ *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 205b.7–207b.3.

⁷⁵ *Vībhāṅga*, Derge Ja 113b.3–122a.7. A Sanskrit version of this text has come down to us as an extract now found at *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell & Neil) 298.24–311.10. For a translation of the first part of the text from its Chinese translation see Jean Przyłuski, “La roue de la vie à Ajantā,” *Journal asiatique* (1920): 313–319; and for Sanskrit fragments of a seemingly similar text see Bernard Pauly, “Fragments sanskrits de haute asie (mission pelliot),” *Journal asiatique* (1959): 228–40.

and corporate structure of the monastic Community. The account culminates in a ruling that mandates how the three equal parts of such a donation must be used.⁷⁶ Even the important series of texts in our Code which deal with the specifically named “Image in the Shade of the Jambu Tree” follows the same pattern. This specifically named image provides another remarkable linkage between our *Vinaya* and the art of the Northwest. Several clearly identifiable examples of this named image have already been recognized in the Gandhāran corpus.⁷⁷ There is, in addition, an inscribed Kuṣāna example made in Mathurā but found at Sāñcī.⁷⁸ The texts which deal with this image also provide a unique and detailed set of rules governing monastic image processions, image processions which are explicitly said to generate large donations and are in fact clearly meant to do so. This series of texts in fact, as now must seem perfectly fitting, ends with another set of rules governing monastic auctions which turn those abundant offerings into cash.⁷⁹

What we see and have seen here is the monastic view of the function of beauty and what we call “art” in the monastery. There may have been other views—in fact there certainly were—but they are not expressed in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, an important monastic Code that almost certainly was written or redacted in Early Northwest India. In the Early Northwest those other views appear to have been expressed by dissident monks who would come to form what we call “the Mahāyāna,” but they—like St. Bernard and for many of the same reasons—appear at least originally not to have approved of art, and to have had little or no interest in promoting elaborate monasteries.⁸⁰ All of this, at the very least, must be sobering. Clearly

⁷⁶ *Adhikaranavastu* (Gnoli) 63.16–69.2—*ato yo buddhasya bhāgas tena gandhakutyām pralepam dadata; yo dharmasya sa dharmadharanām pudgalānām; yah saṃghasya tam samagrah saṃgho bhajayatū;* cf. Schopen 1995, 500 [= *BM* 119].

⁷⁷ See most recently A.M. Quagliotti, “A Gandharan Bodhisattva with Sūrya on the Headdress and Related Problems,” in *South Asian Archaeology 1997. Serie Orientale Roma* 90.3, eds. M. Taddei & G. de Marco (Rome, 2000) 1125–1154, and figs. 3, 4 and 6 for good photos of three examples.

⁷⁸ See most recently M. Willis, “The Sāñcī Bodhisattva dated Kuṣāna Year 28,” *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 6 (1999/2000) 269–273.

⁷⁹ The fullest treatment of these texts so far may be found in Ch. IV of Gregory Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India* (Honolulu, 2005) entitled “On Sending Monks Back to their Books: Cult and Conservatism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism.”

⁸⁰ See Schopen 1999, 279–324; and Ch. IV of Schopen 2005.

we have much more to learn about the Buddhist monks who handled the coins we collect and used the pots that we classify. They were not, it seems, what we have been told they were.

Abbreviations

MBBM	Gregory Schopen, <i>Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India</i> (Honolulu, 2004)
Derge	<i>The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition</i> , ed. A.W. Barber (Taipei, 1991): all references, unless otherwise indicated, are to the 'Dul ba section of the <i>Bka'gyur</i> .
<i>Divyāvadāna</i> (Cowell and Neil)	Edward B. Cowell and Robert A. Neil, <i>The Divyāvadāna. A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends</i> (Cambridge, U.K., 1886)
GMs	Nalinaksha Dutt, <i>Gilgit Manuscripts</i> , III.1 (Srinagar, 1947), III.2 (Srinagar, 1942), III.3 (Srinagar, 1943), III.4 (Calcutta, 1950)
Pāli <i>Vinaya</i>	Hermann Oldenberg, <i>The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language</i> (London, 1879–1883) 5 vols.
<i>Poṣadhadavastu</i> (Hu-von Hinüber)	Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, <i>Das Poṣadhadavastu. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13</i> (Reinbek, Germany, 1994)
<i>Pravrajyāvastu</i> (Eimer)	Helmut Eimer, <i>Rab tu 'byung ba'i gži. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins. Asiatische Forschungen</i> 82 (Wiesbaden, 1983) 2 vols.
<i>Saṅghabhedavastu</i> (Gnoli)	Raniero Gnoli, <i>The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu. Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the</i>

Śayanāsanavastu (Gnoli) *Mūlasarvāstivādin. Serie Orientale*
Roma 49.1–2 (Rome, 1977–78)
Raniero Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript*
of the Śayanāsanavastu and the
Adhikaraṇavastu. Being the 15th and 16th
Sections of the Vinaya of the
Mūlasarvāstivādin. Serie Orientale
Roma 50 (Rome, 1978)

Vinayasūtra (Sankrityayana) *Rahul Sankrityayana, Vinayasūtra of*
Bhadanta Guṇaprabha. Singhi Jain
Śāstra Śikṣāpīṭha. Singhi Jain Series
74 (Bombay, 1981)

* In a stylistically slightly variant form this paper has also been published as Ch. 2 of *BMBM*.